

### **REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application in light of the amendments and remarks. All references herein to “the Office Action” refer to the office action dated August 12, 2005.

#### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

In the Office Action dated August 12, 2005, claims 1-15 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Thurlow, U.S. patent number 6,457,879 (referred to hereinafter as “Thurlow”). Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections of claims 1-15 and 18 are rendered moot in view of applicant’s cancellation of these claims, and further submits that the rejections are inapplicable to new claims 21-51 as limitations recited in the new claims differ from those in the cancelled claims.

For example, newly added independent claim 21 recites in part, “sending a business message to a server, the business message having additional data attached”. Newly added independent claims 33 and 45 recite in part, “receiving a business message from a client, the business message having additional data attached, the data being moved to a data store for subsequent processing”. Newly added independent claim 48 recites in part, “a client computer system of a first e-commerce trading partner (first computer system), the first computer system being connected to a network, the first computer system including a sender component and being capable of sending a polling message”. These recited claim limitations are not present in any of the rejected claims cancelled herein. Additionally, the cited reference, Thurlow, fails to disclose the recited claim limitations of the newly added claims.

For at least these reasons, applicant respectfully submits the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejections of claims 1-15 and 18 are moot, the cited reference fails to disclose applicant's newly added claims, and therefore the amendments are fully responsive to the office action. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application for allowance.

### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

In the office action, claims 16-17 and 19-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thurlow in view of Lerner. Applicant submits that like the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejections discussed supra, the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of claims 16-17 and 19-20 are rendered moot in light of applicants cancellation of these claims. Further, as discussed, Thurlow fails to disclose the recited claim limitations of applicant's newly added claims 21-51. Likewise, the combined references fail to teach or suggest the recited claim limitations of applicant's newly added claims.

For at least these reasons, applicant respectfully submits the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of claims 16-17 and 19-20 are moot, the combined references fail to teach or suggest applicant's newly added claims, and therefore the amendments are fully responsive to the office action. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application for allowance.

### **CONCLUSION**

In light of the amendments and arguments set forth herein, applicants respectfully submit that the rejections have been properly overcome, and requests reconsideration of the application for allowance.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overages to Deposit Account No.

02-2666.



Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 12, 2005

12400 Wilshire Blvd.  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025  
(503) 439-8778

Patrick D. Boyd  
Registration No. 54,671

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:  
Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

On: December 12, 2005

Signature:

  
Katherine Jennings